

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 1, 3, 6, 11 and 14 have been amended. Claims 2, 4, 5, 7-10, 12, 13, 15 and 16 have been cancelled.

A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1, 3, 6, 11 and 14 are now pending in this application.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,181,503 to Choi et al. (hereinafter “Choi”). This rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Applicant relies on M.P.E.P. § 2131, entitled “Anticipation – Application of 35 U.S.C. § 102(a), (b) and (e)” which states, “a claim is anticipated only if each and every element set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” Applicant respectfully submits that Choi does not describe each and every element of the claims.

Independent claim 1 (as amended) recites an “apparatus for detecting an IP (Internet Protocol) address on a network including at least a DNS (Domain Name System) server” that includes: “a search IP address detector for detecting at least one search IP address from IP addresses which are a predetermined number of IP addresses selected as a unit from possible IP addresses on the network, by sending an ARP (Address Resolution Protocol) request to the IP addresses and receiving an ARP response to the ARP request.” “a DNS message transceiver for sending a DNS query message to the at least one search IP address and receiving its response message,” “a DNS server detector for identifying a DNS response message from the response message and detecting an IP address of a source DNS server from

the DNS response message,” “an ICMP message transceiver for sending an ICMP echo request message to the at least one search IP address and receiving its ICMP response message,” and “a router detector for detecting an IP address of a source router from the ICMP response message, wherein the ICMP response message is either an ICMP redirect request message or an ICMP time exceed message.” (emphasis added.) Independent claims 11 and 14 recite analogous features.

In contrast, Choi fails to teach or disclose all of the features of independent claim 1. Choi is directed towards searching for a DNS server in an outernet. (Title, Abstract). The Office Action asserts that “Col 5, line 5 et seq” meets the claim limitation “detecting at least one search IP address...by sending an ARP (Address Resolution Protocol) request to the IP addresses and receiving an ARP response to the ARP request.” as recited in independent claim 1. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Col. 5, line 5 et seq of Choi discloses a DNS search message creating unit 21 that automatically creates the address of a transmitter and a DNS search message. A DNS search message creating unit 21 is not “a search IP address detector for detecting at least one search IP address...by sending an ARP (Address Resolution Protocol) request to the IP addresses and receiving an ARP response to the ARP request.” Moreover ARP is not mentioned in the disclosure of Choi. Accordingly, Choi fails to disclose “detecting at least one search IP address...by sending an ARP (Address Resolution Protocol) request to the IP addresses and receiving an ARP response to the ARP request,” as claimed in amended claim 1.

Further, the Office Action states that Col. 11, lines 23-54 disclose an ICMP message communication section. However, Choi fails to disclose, teach or suggest “a router detector for detecting an IP address of a source router from the ICMP response message, wherein the ICMP response message is either an ICMP redirect request message or an ICMP time exceed message” as claimed in independent claim 1.

M.P.E.P. § 2131 states that “[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the...claim.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim. *See In re Bond*,

Conclusion


Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 10/1/08

By 

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 295-4623
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

W. Keith Robinson
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 59,396